

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11 and 15-32 are pending in the application.

Claim 15 is allowed and claims 20-25 are objected to.

Claim 20 is amended to independent form herein. Claims 21-25 depend from claim 20.

It is respectfully requested the claims 20-25 be allowed.

Independent claim 27 and dependent claim 28 are cancelled.

Claims 11, 17, and 18 were objected to because of the informalities. Claims 11 and 17 are amended as suggested in the Office Action. It is respectfully requested the objection be withdrawn.

Claims 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 31 and 32 are amended to clarify the claim and remove the word "which." It is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

Independent claims 1-3, 5, 11, 16-17, 19 and 30 are amended to clarify applicant's claimed invention. These claims recite that spatial range information of them includes a latitude of an object, a longitude thereof, and a bubble diameter thereof in the space. Also claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 11, 16, 17, 19, and 30 recite that a pair of the latitude and longitude is a center point of the spatial range, and the bubble diameter is a radius of the spatial range. The altitude information has been removed. No new matter is entered.

Claims 1-6, 9, 11, 16-19, and 26-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Maruyama et al. (Maruyama).

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maruyama in view of Gaspard, II.

Applicant's claim 1 recites that a server has a database, an extracting section, and a

providing section. The database retains plural pieces of bubble data, each of the bubble data pieces having a piece of spatial range information, which specifies a spatial range in a space, and includes a latitude of an object, a longitude thereof and a bubble diameter thereof in the space, and a pair of the latitude and longitude is a center point of the spatial range, and the bubble diameter is a radius of the spatial range.

Maruyama discloses that a spatial information database includes map information and contents information about movies, entertainment, and business events, etc.

However, the spatial information database of Maruyama does not have any data corresponding to the bubble data of applicant's claimed invention. Maruyama discloses that a spatial information which tells a current position of a user. However, the spatial information of Maruyama does not include the bubble diameter as the radius of the spatial information.

Also claim 1 recites the extracting section retrieves from the database a spatial range information piece whose spatial range includes a position that accords with the positional information piece, and extracting a retrieval information piece associated with the retrieved spatial range information piece from the database.

In contrast Maruyama does not disclose specifically the relationship between the location information and the map information, etc.

Further in applicant's claim 1 the providing section provides the user terminal with a service information piece linked with the retrieval information extracted by the extracting section. In contrast Maruyama fails to disclose or suggest the way to provide the user terminal with the service information, and Maruyama is silent about the spatial range information.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 16, 17, 19 and 30 also recite a database having a piece of spatial range information substantially similar to that of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted claims 1-6, 9, 11, 16-19, and 26-32 are different from Maruyama et al. and the rejection should be withdrawn.

With regard to the obviousness rejection Gaspard II is also totally silent about the pair of the latitude and longitude is a center point of the spatial range, and the bubble diameter is a radius of the spatial range as recited in the claimed feature of the present invention.

Because the combination of Maruyama and Gaspard II fail to teach or suggest all the claimed features of claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 11, 16, 17, 19, and 30; in the absence of a considerable reconstruction to at least one of the cited references, any expert in the art would not reach the subject matter recited in them. Therefore the combination fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under MPEP 2143 which requires, three basic criteria must be met including the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Claims 4, 6-9, 18, 20-26, 29, 31, and 32 as either original or amended, each depend directly or indirectly from amended claims 1, 2, 3, 17, and 19 and should be allowed because they recite the additional features.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian S. Myers
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-8800
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987
Docket No.: FUJS 18.428 (100794-11649)
BSM:fd